

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,323	02/06/2004	Richard E. Waitkus JR.	016093.0117 8540	
23640	7590 02/15/2006		EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS, LLP GIBSON, RANDY 910 LOUISIANA		ANDY W		
HOUSTON, TX 77002-4995			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2841	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/774,323	WAITKUS, RICHARD E.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Randy W. Gibson	2841	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 25 or 25	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		S
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to by the Examine 10) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. e: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objecte drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d	d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Date of Informal F 6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/774,323 Page 2

Art Unit: 2841

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the target level" lacks positive antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14, 15, and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Neumann et al (US # 5,016,197). Neumann disclose the claimed invention including one or more bailers (10) at one or more locations (Col.5, lines 29-35), each bailer having a compression plate (16), one or more weight measurement devices (500), and a weight recording device (Col. 5, lines 46-49). With respect to claim 2, the weight measurement device is a load cell (Col. 15, line 20).

Regard claim 3, the weight, or fullness of the bailer can be determined by a number of means including: hydraulic pressure (Col. 9, lines 47-61); distance traveled

by the compression plate (Col. 12, lines 32-52); or, motor current (Col. 14, lines 9-56). With regards to claims 7 & 28-32, the device determines when a container is almost full (Col. 15, lines 41-42).

With regards to claim 9, it is disclosed to calculate bailer fullness based on more than one parameter (Col. 14, lines 57-63). With regards to claim 10, the device dispatches a bale hauler (Col. 5, lines 51-53).

With regards to claim 14, it would be inherent that the step of determining when to remove the bales would be based on the hauler's limitations since one could not fill an already full truck; the driver would simply refuse to go to a customer's location until he had a chance to empty his truck first. With regards to claim 33, it is inherent that garbage includes the materials listed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 6. Claims 5, 6, 12, and 16-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neumann et al (US # 5,016,197) in view of Neumann (US # 4,773,027). As discussed above, Neumann ('197) except for determining when a bailer will be full based on the weight of the bale and customer usage patterns (claim 6), and determing when to remove bails based on customer preferences. Neumann ('027) teach that it is known to predict when a bailer will be full based on the detected amount

of the material in the bale and customer usage patterns (Col. 1, lines 50-68). It would have been obvious to the ordinary practioner to modify when the bailer of Neumann ('197) predict when a bailer will be full based on the weight of the bale and customer usage patterns, as suggested by Neumann ('027), in order to predict more accurately when a customer needs service.

With regards to claims 5 & 12, since customer usage patterns are already being monitored and recorded, it would have been an obvious step to also record the number and frequency of bales ejected in order to more accurately predict when a customer needs future service.

With regards to claims 13 & 22-24, it would be obvious that the hauler would consider customer preferences since it might be impossible to get physical access to the bailer if the hauler arrives at the customer's location outside the customer's normal business hours.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy W. Gibson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2103. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri., 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamand Cuneo can be reached on (571) 272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/774,323 Page 5

Art Unit: 2841

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Randy W. Gibson Primary Examiner Art Unit 2841